

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via EFS-Web to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below

Dated: August 7, 2006

Signature: /Scott E. Baxendale/  
(Scott E. Baxendale)

Docket No.: 29757/P-265  
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:  
Richard E. Rowe

Application No.: 09/761,031

Art Unit: 3714

Filed: January 16, 2001

Examiner: Shah, Milap

For: CASINO GAMBLING MACHINE WITH  
BONUS ROUND AWARD REDEMPTION

**APPLICANT'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

On August 7, 2006, Applicant's attorney, Scott E. Baxendale, conducted a telephonic interview with Examiners Shah and Jones regarding the rejections from the February 3, 2006 Office action and the arguments presented in the Applicant's response filed on July 3, 2006. Mr. Baxendale and Examiners Shah and Jones first discussed the second-last limitation of Claim 1 reciting that the controller is programmed to cause the value-dispensing mechanism to dispense the bonus payout in response to detecting a selection by the user, and to add the bonus payout to the user's credits in response to not detecting the selection. Examiner Shah contended that the limitation as written recited events that could occur in the alternative, and therefore the limitation could be satisfied by a gaming unit that either dispensed a bonus payout or a gaming unit that added a bonus payout to the user's credits. In response, Mr. Baxendale pointed out that Claim 1 as written recites that the controller programming to process a user selection to dispense the bonus payout is present and the gambling unit is configured to process the user selection even during occurrences of the bonus game wherein the bonus payout is added to the available credits and not dispensed by the gambling unit. In view of this, Examiners Shah and Jones agreed that this limitation is not met by a gambling

unit that merely adds the bonus payout to the available credits each time the bonus game is executed.

Mr. Baxendale and Examiners Shah and Jones next discussed the proposed modification to Schneider et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,089,976) to provide user selection between adding a bonus payout to the player's available credits and dispensing the bonus payout before returning to the main gambling game. The parties first discussed the teaching in Schneider et al. of a gaming apparatus in which a credit meter is incremented or the player is paid directly based on the matching bonus amounts, and not by player selection. The parties then discussed the arguments presented in the Applicant's recently-filed response. The Examiners agreed that Schneider et al. do not teach player selection as recited in the claims, and that the arguments in the Applicant's response successfully rebutted the asserted motivations for modifying Schneider et al. set forth in the previous Office action. Examiner Shah indicated that the obviousness rejection in view of Schneider et al. has been overcome pending the outcome of additional searching.

Mr. Baxendale and Applicant again thank Examiners Shah and Jones for their time and consideration in addressing these issues.

Dated: August 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By /Scott E. Baxendale/

Scott E. Baxendale

Registration No.: 41,605

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant